

1 TRINETTE G. KENT (State Bar No. 222020)
2 10645 North Tatum Blvd., Suite 200-192
3 Phoenix, AZ 85028
4 Telephone: (480) 247-9644
5 Facsimile: (480) 717-4781
6 E-mail: tkent@lemb erglaw.com

7 Of Counsel to
8 Lemberg Law, LLC
9 A Connecticut Law Firm
10 43 Danbury Road
11 Wilton, CT 06897
12 Telephone: (203) 653-2250
13 Facsimile: (203) 653-3424

14 Attorneys for Plaintiff,
15 Maisie Kelly

16
17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
18 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

19
20 Maisie Kelly,

21 Case No.: '16CV1827 CAB JLB

22 Plaintiff,

23
24 **COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES**

25 vs.

26
27 **FOR VIOLATIONS OF:**

28 AmSher Receivables Management aka
AmSher Collection Services,

29
30 Defendant.

31
32 **1. THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER
33 PROTECTION ACT;**
**2. THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION
34 PRACTICES ACT; AND**
**3. THE ROSENTHAL FAIR DEBT
35 COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT**

36
37 **JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

38

1 Plaintiff, Maisie Kelly (hereafter “Plaintiff”), by undersigned counsel, brings
2 the following complaint against AmSher Receivables Management aka AmSher
3 Collection Services (hereafter “Defendant”) and alleges as follows:

4

5 **JURISDICTION**

6 1. This action arises out of Defendant’s repeated violations of the
7 Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.* (“TCPA”), repeated
8 violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, *et seq.*
9 (“FDCPA”), and repeated violations of the Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices
10 Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 1788, *et seq.* (“Rosenthal Act”).

11

12 2. Jurisdiction of this Court arises under 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3), 15 U.S.C. §
13 1692k(d), Cal. Civ. Code 1788.30(f), 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

14

15 3. Venue is proper before this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), where
16 the acts and transactions giving rise to Plaintiff’s action occurred in this district and/or
17 where Defendant transacts business in this district.

18

19 **PARTIES**

20

21 4. Plaintiff is an adult individual residing in San Diego, California, and is a
22 “person” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39) and Cal Civ. Code § 1788.2(g).

23

24 5. Plaintiff is a “consumer” as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3), and is a
25 “debtor” as defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.2(h).

26

27

28

1 6. Defendant is a business entity located in Birmingham, Alabama, and is a
2 "person" as the term is defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39) and Cal Civ. Code §
3
4 1788.2(g).

5 7. Defendant uses instrumentalities of interstate commerce or the mails in a
6
7 business the principle purpose of which is the collection of debts and/or regularly
8 collects or attempts to collect debts owed or asserted to be owed to another, and is a
9 “debt collector” as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

11 8. Defendant, in the ordinary course of business, regularly, on behalf of
12 itself or others, engages in the collection of consumer debts, and is a “debt collector”
13 as defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.2(c).

ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

17 9. Upon information and belief, a financial obligation was allegedly
18 incurred by a person who is not a party to this lawsuit (hereafter “Debtor”).

19 10. Plaintiff is not the Debtor, has no location information regarding the
20 Debtor, and has no responsibility for repayment of Debtor's debt.
21

22 11. Debtor's alleged obligation arises from a transaction in which property,
23 services or money was acquired on credit primarily for personal, family or household
24 purposes, is a "debt" as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5), and is a "consumer debt" as
25 defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.2(f).
26

1 12. At all times mentioned herein where Defendant communicated with any
2 person via telephone, such communication was done via Defendant's agent,
3 representative or employee.
4

5 13. At all times mentioned herein, Plaintiff utilized a cellular telephone
6 service and was assigned the following telephone number: 619-XXX-7300 (hereafter
7 "Number").
8

9 14. Defendant placed calls to Plaintiff's Number in an attempt to collect a
10 debt.
11

12 15. The aforementioned calls were placed using an automatic telephone
13 dialing system ("ATDS") and/or by using an artificial or prerecorded voice
14 ("Robocalls").
15

16 16. When answering the calls from Defendant, Plaintiff was met with a
17 Robocall instructing her to enter an account number.
18

19 17. On multiple occasions Plaintiff informed Defendant that it was calling
20 the wrong number and demanded that Defendant to cease further calls.
21

22 18. Nevertheless, Defendant continued to call Plaintiff's Number using an
23 ATDS and/or Robocalls at an excessive and harassing rate.
24

25 19. Defendant's calls directly interfered with Plaintiff's right to peacefully
26 enjoy a service that Plaintiff paid for and caused Plaintiff a significant amount of
27 anxiety, frustration and annoyance.
28

COUNT I

**VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT, 47
U.S.C. § 227, et seq.**

20. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this complaint as though fully stated herein.

21. The TCPA prohibits Defendant from using, other than for emergency purposes, an ATDS and/or Robocalls when calling Plaintiff's Number absent Plaintiff's prior express consent to do so. *See* 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).

22. Defendant's telephone system has the earmark of using an ATDS and/or using Robocalls in that Plaintiff, upon answering calls from Defendant, heard a Robocall prompting her to enter an account number.

23. Defendant called Plaintiff's Number using an ATDS and/or Robocalls without Plaintiff's consent in that Defendant either never had Plaintiff's prior express consent to do so or such consent was effectively revoked when Plaintiff requested that Defendant cease all further calls.

24. Defendant continued to willfully call Plaintiff's Number using an ATDS and/or Robocalls knowing that it lacked the requisite consent to do so in violation of the TCPA.

25. Plaintiff was harmed and suffered damages as a result of Defendant's actions

1 26. The TCPA creates a private right of action against persons who violate
2 the Act. *See* 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3).
3

4 27. As a result of each call made in violation of the TCPA, Plaintiff is
5 entitled to an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages.
6

7 28. As a result of each call made knowingly and/or willingly in violation of
8 the TCPA, Plaintiff may be entitled to an award of treble damages.
9

10 **COUNT II**

11 **VIOLATIONS OF THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT, 15**
12 **U.S.C. § 1692, et seq.**

13 29. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this
14 complaint as though fully stated herein.
15

16 30. The FDCPA was passed in order to protect consumers from the use of
17 abusive, deceptive and unfair debt collection practices and in order to eliminate such
18 practices.
19

20 31. Defendant contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect a debt and engaged
21 in “communications” as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).
22

23 32. Defendant communicated with the Plaintiff regarding a third-party debt
24 more than once without being requested to do so, in violation of 15 U.S.C. §
25 1692b(3).
26

1 33. Defendant engaged in conduct, the natural consequence of which was to
2 harass, oppress, or abuse Plaintiff, in connection with the collection of a debt, in
3
4 violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692d.

5 34. Defendant caused Plaintiff's phone to ring or engaged Plaintiff in
6 telephone conversations repeatedly or continuously, with the intent to annoy, abuse
7 and harass Plaintiff, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(5).
8

9 35. The foregoing acts and/or omissions of Defendant constitute numerous
10 and multiple violations of the FDCPA, including every one of the above-cited
11 provisions.
12

13 36. Plaintiff was harmed and is entitled to damages as a result of Defendant's
14 violations.
15

COUNT III

**VIOLATIONS OF THE ROSENTHAL FAIR DEBT COLLECTION
PRACTICES ACT, Cal. Civ. Code § 1788, et seq.**

20 37. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this
21 complaint as though fully stated herein.

23 38. The Rosenthal Act was passed to prohibit debt collectors from engaging
24 in unfair and deceptive acts and practices in the collection of consumer debts.

25 39. Defendant caused Plaintiff's telephone to ring repeatedly or continuously
26
27 to annoy Plaintiff, in violation of Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.11(d).

1 40. Defendant communicated with Plaintiff with such frequency as to be
2 unreasonable, constituting harassment, in violation of Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.11(e).
3

4 41. Defendant did not comply with the provisions of 15 U.S.C. § 1692, *et*
5 *seq.*, in violation of Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.17.

6 42. Plaintiff was harmed and is entitled to damages as a result of Defendant's
7 violations.
8

9

10 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

11 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendant for:

12 A. Statutory damages of \$500.00 for each call determined to be in violation
13 of the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3);
14
15 B. Treble damages for each violation determined to be willful and/or
16 knowing under the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3);
17
18 C. Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);
19
20 D. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A);
21
22 E. Actual damages pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(a);
23
24 F. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for knowingly and willfully committing
25 violations pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(b);
26
27 G. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C.
28 § 1692k(a)(3) and Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(c);
28
28 H. Punitive damages; and

1 I. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.
2

3 **TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS**
4

5

6 DATED: July 15, 2016

7

8 TRINETTE G. KENT

9 By: /s/ Trinette G. Kent
10 Trinette G. Kent, Esq.
11 Lemberg Law, LLC
12 Attorney for Plaintiff, Maisie Kelly
13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28